REMARKS
UPON
Some Places
OF
Mr. *Whiſton's* BOOKS,
EITHER
Printed *or in* Manuſcript.

By P. ALLIX, D. D.

LONDON:
Printed for JOHN WYAT, at the *Roſe* in S. *Paul's* Church-yard. MDCCXI.

SOME REMARKS, &c.

THough I know it was St. *Jerome's* Opinion, that a Man ought not to bear the Charge of Herefy with Indifference; yet I was not much diſturbed on the reading what Mr. *Whiſton* has lately ſaid concerning me, in his *Hiſtorical Preface*. He has laid the ſame Charge againſt ſeveral other Divines with whom he has converſed; and what reaſon have I to expect a more civil Treatment than they? Thoſe Words of mine which he relates, were ſpoken in a Converſation, at which many other Divines and Miniſters of *London* were preſent: And ſince none of them were diſpleas'd with what I then ſaid, it is plain that Mr. *Whiſton* muſt have put a wrong Interpretation on them; and indeed, muſt even at that time have gone off from the Doctrine of the Chriſtian Church. However, I am willing to give the Publick an Account of that Converſation, and ſhew, that Mr. *Whiſton* has not acted in this Matter ſo fairly and ſincerely as he ought.

The late Dr. *Payne*, as Mr. *Whiſton* ſaith, (for I think they both joined in the Queſtion) having ask'd me, Whether the Holy Spirit was addreſs'd to in the publick Prayers of the Primitive Church? I anſwer'd, That if they had ever read the Works of St. *Baſil* the Great, they would have found a ſatisfactory Anſwer to their Queſtion, for that he had writ a large Diſcourſe on that very Subject; in which he not only ſuppoſes, that all their publick Prayers were directed to the Father by the Interceſſion of the Son, in the Holy Spirit; but proves likewiſe, that the Deity of the Spirit was generally ſuppoſed by the Church in that Form, though it was not formally directed to him alone. I adviſed them to read that Piece of St. *Baſil*, who had a natural Occaſion of examining this Matter by the Complaint which was made againſt him, that in the Doxology he uſed indifferently theſe Words, *Glory be to the Father, with the Son, and in* or *with the Holy Ghoſt*. And indeed St. *Baſil* writing near 50 Years after the Riſe of *Arianiſm* (which gave the Hint to *Macedonius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* to deny the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, and to do all he could to ſupport his Hereſy) has ſolidly defended the Senſe of the Primitive Church in all Times and Places concerning the Deity of the Holy Spirit, and confuted all the Arguments of the *Macedonians*. This is the Subſtance of that Converſation. And I am ſure the Divines and Miniſters who were there and

the

then present little thought I had therein given any Occasion for such a Charge as Mr. *Whiston* has now, at the distance of 12 or 13 Years, publickly brought against me. He has given me, indeed, the Title of *The very learned Doctor, &c.* But, as he doubtless has his Reasons for what he does, I suppose he might design at the same time, that it should serve for the Justification of himself. *Timeo Danaos & dona ferentes.* Some Months ago one of Mr. *Whiston*'s Friends told me he had heard from Mr. *Whiston* such an Account of that Conversation as he has since Printed. I then told the Gentleman the whole Truth of the Matter, and what then pass'd between us. But I thought it of so little Importance, that, though Mr. *Whiston* came afterwards to visit me in Company with some Friends of his, I did not think it necessary to take any Notice of it, after the Explanation I had given his Friend, and which, in all probability, came to his Ears; especially since I could not have done it without blaming him for his Incivility in making his own Use of what I had said, by changing the State of the Question, and suppressing a part of my Answer: an Incivility so much the greater, because I had referred them to St. *Basil*'s Book *de Spiritu Sancto*, for an Account of my Sentiments about the Question they proposed. I have had several Opportunities of conversing with Mr. *Whiston*, and I am satisfy'd he never look'd upon me as one who inclined in the least to his Opinions. I thought him a

ſtudious Man, and had a Reſpect for him as ſuch; and he will do me the Juſtice to acknowledge, that I always ſpoke my Mind to him very freely and ſincerely; but, that I never approved of the Liberties he took, which indeed were more than could be well born with. I was inform'd, that when he Preach'd at the Lecture founded by the late Honourable *Mr. Boyle*, he aſſerted that the firſt Verſe of the Prophecy of *Ezekiel* had been miſplaced by the Copyiſts, and that it belong'd to Chap. xxx. He did me the Honour afterwards to come and ſee me in Company with the Rev^d Dr. *Clark* of *S. James's*. I then enquired whether that Report (which I could ſcarce believe) were true or no? Upon his owning that it was ſo, and ſtanding to it, I thought it the part of a Friend to let him know, I. That the Liberty he had taken, and which he had been blam'd for giving himſelf in his *Harmony*, wherein he had taken St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel all to pieces, and ſet it together again after his own Fancy, was of very fatal Conſequence to the Holy Scriptures. II. That, though it ſhould be allow'd him in the Paſſage out of *Ezekiel*, he could never, according to his Undertaking, prove againſt the Atheiſts, that the Fulfilling of that Prophecy againſt *Egypt* was exact; becauſe that ſuppoſing the Date of the firſt Chapter of *Ezekiel* were remov'd to the xxx^th, it would follow from thence, that the Prophecy was publiſh'd ſeveral Years after *Nebuchadnezzar*'s Conqueſt of *Egypt*, even according

ding

ding to his own Chronology. The Atheists would laugh at such an Interpretation, but would never be convinced by it. But he did not think fit to follow my Advice. I desired him then to consider of the Matter a second time before he publish'd his Sermons; but I think he has made no Correction or Alteration in that Place. Now just to shew the monstrous Absurdity which the Atheists may charge him with, even upon the Foot of his own Chronology, which is that of *Usher*: The 30th Year after the Captivity of *Jeconias*, is the Year 565 before Christ, because the first Year of that Captivity he supposeth, with *Usher*, to have been the 595th Year before Christ. Now 'tis certain that *Pharaoh Hophra* King of *Egypt* dy'd the Year 569 before Christ, when *Nebuchadnezzar* invaded *Egypt*: From whence it will follow, that the Prophecy of the Conquest of *Egypt* will have been publish'd four Years after the Event. A pretty way this is of convincing the Atheists, that the Prophecies of the Old Testament are divinely inspired! Is not the Prophet *Ezekiel* very much obliged to Mr. *Whiston* for the Liberty he has taken to remove the first Verse of Chap. i. and place it before Chap. xxx. and so to expose his Prophecies to the Banter of the Atheists and Libertines, by making him gravely foretell an Event as future which had actually passed some Years before his Prophecy. Tho indeed if they would act reasonably, they should not condemn the Scriptures, but blame Mr. *Whiston*'s Rashness.

He again visited me since his professing himself an *Arian*; and he can witness that I exhorted him seriously to pay some Deference to the Advice of one of the most learned Prelates of our Church, by whom he had the Honour to be respected; and who, I knew, had written to him concerning his new Opinions, in order to recover him. I represented to him with some Earnestness, how ill it became a Person of his Age to be so Positive as I had always found him, especially since he had spent so much of his time in Mathematical Studies, and therefore could not have sufficiently apply'd himself to the Study of Antiquity, upon which nevertheless he pretended to build his Scheme; and, that it was a very odd Fancy, for him to think he could revive a Heresy which had been dead and buried for so many Ages; and that too after it had been supported by the Supreme Powers both in the East and West for about an hundred Years; and was brought in at first, as well as maintained afterwards, by Persecution and Violence, against the antient Faith.

This Advice was only heard: But as I always entertain'd Mr. *Whiston* with Respect and Civility, he left his Book concerning the *Apostolical Constitutions* at my House about 15 Months ago, with a Desire that I would read it, and send it to Dr. *Grabe*. I read it in three or four Days, as he desired me, and made such Remarks as I thought proper on Mr. *Whiston*'s new System, as it was laid down in it. But I did not think fit

fit to ſend them to him, becauſe I heard he was to return to *London* in a little time; and becauſe I alſo underſtood from the late illuſtrious Baron *Spanheim*, that my Lord Archbiſhop of *York* had commanded Dr. *Grabe* to Examine that Book of Mr. *Whiſton*'s.

Beſides that, Mr. *Whiſton* ſeem'd not to me to have examin'd the Marks of *Suppoſition* which ſeveral learned Men have found in the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*. And indeed, as I learned from one of his Friends, he had never read *Dallæus*'s Book *de Pſeudepigraphis Apoſtolicis*, where that learned Man has demonſtrated the Book of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* to be ſpurious. But according to Mr. *Whiſton*, that Book is the moſt Canonical Book in the whole New Teſtament, becauſe all the other are only ſupported by its Authority; but in the Judgment of all the learned Criticks, both Papiſts and Proteſtants, it was forged by ſome Impoſtor after the firſt Council of *Nice*, that is, after the Year 325 of Chriſt. My Judgment cannot add any new Weight to the united Suffrages of the greateſt Men in both Communions. When he ſhall have publiſh'd his Book, the World will be amazed at ſuch Heaps of Conjectures, and bare Aſſertions, without any Foundation, or ſo much as the leaſt Probability on his ſide. More lately Mr. *Whiſton* came and entertained me with a new Diſcovery of an *Arabick* Tranſlation of the Conſtitutions at *Oxford* and at *Vienna*, which he hoped would convince all the

World.

World. This, I thought, was a very particular Fancy. I told him he would find nothing in such a Manuscript which would answer his high Expectations; that he could get nothing from the *Arabians*, but some things writ in the Xth Century, at which time the Christians, as well as the Jews and Samaritans, having forgot the *Greek* Language, under the Empire of the *Mahometans*, then their Masters, began to Translate the Scriptures into *Arabick* for the Use of their People; and, that he might make a Judgment of what he might expect to find by that which Dr. *Beverege* publish'd under the Title of *The Canons of the first Council of* Nice, which was the most wretched Imposture put upon the World. But he was too much prejudiced to be moved by any thing I could say. I know that *Alvarez* tells us in his *Relations of Ethiopia*, that the King of *Ethiopia* ask'd him whether the Christians in the West had the eight Books of the *Constitutions* which were among them? They call them in their Language *Manda*, or *Abetilis*; and, if we may take the King's Word for it, they observe them very religiously. Mr. *Whiston* possibly may perswade himself that S. *Clement* sent a Copy of them into *Ethiopia*, which has been carefully preserv'd among them ever since: But I can assure him, if he thinks so, he is much mistaken: for that good Prince thought that the Eunuch of the Queen *Candace* converted his Royal Mistress and her Subjects, who inhabited the Isle of

Meroe.

Meroe. But the *Ethiopians* who live farther in the Continent of *Africa*, were converted in the IVth Century; *Frumentius*, who was ordain'd for them by St. *Athanasius*, being their first Bishop, as is well known to all who understand Church History. And the same King *David* tells Pope *Clement* VII. in 1533, that he receiv'd the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity in the Unity of the Divine Essence. So that there is little Probability that S. *Matthew* carry'd among them the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which the Bishops who sat in the Council in *Trullo* (tho' no extraordinary Criticks) did yet find out to have been corrupted by some Heretick. *Can.* 2. One thing which moved me not a little, (when I observed how fond he was of meer Chimera's) was, that whereas in a Book publish'd about five Years since, he affirmed with Mr. *Mede* that the Heresies came out of the Dragon's Mouth as a Flood, which would have destroy'd the Church if the Earth had not helped her; I, He now looks upon *Arius*, who first gave Occasion to the Idolatry practised by the Christians of his Sect, as the Restorer of the antient Faith of the Christians; and would plunge us again into Idolatry: For certainly the Religious Worship of Creatures is Idolatry: And one of the most essential Marks of the Apostacy of the *Romish* Church, is the Religious Worship which she pays to *those that by Nature are no Gods.* II. He falls upon S. *Athanasius* in the foulest manner in the World; and represents him as

the

the greateſt Villain that ever lived. But he ought to have known, and would, if he had allow'd himſelf time to read the Pieces of the fourth Century, that *Athanaſius* did but follow *Alexander*, his Predeceſſor, who had called *Arius* Antichriſt, or the Forerunner of him, becauſe he worſhipped *Jeſus Chriſt*, tho he thought him no more than an excellent Creature; and that the ſame *Athanaſius* diſtinguiſhed himſelf for 46 Years together by his oppoſing the Efforts of *Arianiſm*. We have a very exact Hiſtory of his Life in 2 Vol. *quarto*, writ by a learned Man, who was a Canon of *Beauvais*. But it is not to be ſuppoſed that Mr. *Whiſton* has given himſelf the trouble of examining it. For my part, I expect ſome or other of his Friends will adviſe him to read the Extracts of *Philoſtorgius*, an *Arian* of the Vth Century, concerning the Life of *Athanaſius*, and to publiſh ſome ſelect Paſſages thereof for general Edification. And as he has received ſuch Light from the *Arabick* Verſion of the *Conſtitutions*, I would have him by all means enquire after the Legend of St. *George* in *Arabick*, which has been a long time in Vogue in the Church of *Rome*, as is alſo that of the pretended Martyr *Artemius*, who dy'd much about the ſame time with the pretended St. *George*. For after his Death, *Artemius* was condemned by *Julian* the Apoſtate, for ſeveral notorious Crimes, whereof we have an Account in *Ammianus Marcellinus*, how that St. *George*, it ſeems, gain'd a Victory over one

Athe

Athanaſius, a famous Magician. That Legend was written by ſome *Arians*, in the time when that Hereſy committed the greateſt Ravages: but it was condemned by *Gelaſius* I. in a Council. But as Mr. *Whiſton* conſiders things according to his Prejudices, ſo he may poſſibly give us ſome Extracts out of that Legend to juſtify himſelf in writing with ſuch Bitterneſs againſt that great Saint, whoſe Name is had in ſuch Veneration by all Chriſtians. The World will ſee upon what Foundation he goes when he ſhall publiſh all his Works; for we have yet ſeen nothing but ſome few Eſſays. I have had good Information that he has changed his Mind ſeveral times within theſe five Years; and therefore I can't but hope, that by reflecting on the Abſurdity of the Work he has undertaken, he may at length drop it, and return to the true Faith. Indeed I always thought him to be extremely fond and tenacious of his Notions; and the Warmth with which he generally ſpeaks and does every thing, gives us ground of Fear, leſt he ſhould run farther and farther in the Hereſy he has contracted: yet I think his Friends ought not to give him over as abſolutely incurable.

I ſee very well, that Mr. *Whiſton* imagines he ſhall do the Chriſtian Religion no inconſiderable Service by delivering the Church from the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that of the eternal Divinity of Chriſt. But ſuch as will carefully attend to his Hypotheſis, will be ſoon convinced, that the Man is wretchedly miſtaken, and

that

that he could never have found out a more ready way to make the Jews, who are well vers'd in the Scriptures, and understand the Spirit of Religion, to reject Christianity. When he is pleased to introduce a *Created God*, he must of necessity, under the Idea of *God*, suppose That Being to be Infinite; but, then, by the Addition of the Word *Created*, he destroys what he before supposed, and pretends it to be a finite Being, created by God the Maker of all Things. By pretending that Christ is the Object of Divine Worship, he advances an impious and wicked Doctrine in the World; for, if Christ be not really and truly God, that is, a Being that has all the Attributes of the Godhead; if he be not Self existing, the great *Jehovah*, Omniscient, Omnipresent, and Almighty; then may we lawfully withdraw our Worship and Adoration from him, as a thing expresly commanded in Scripture. This is the great Argument which the Fathers always urged with Success against the *Arians*, and for which Reason they ever looked upon them to be guilty of Idolatry.

But if this Controversy be considered with a particular Regard to the Jews, I then maintain, that, according to the Principles of that Nation, it will ever be impossible, so long as Christ is proposed to them as a Created Being, how excellent soever he is supposed to be, to perswade them to give Worship to him. The first Fathers of the Church ever acknowledged that the Angel to whom Adoration is constantly

given

iven in those Appearances recorded in the Old Testament, was the λόγος; and this also was he received Doctrine of the Synagogue, as we earn from the Testimony of *Philo* the Jew. But when *Arianism* appeared in the World, which aught indeed that This same Angel was the λόγος, but maintained at the same time, that his λόγος was a Created Being; the fatal Consequence of that Doctrine ended in Idolatry, which was immediately introduced into the Church of Christ: and from thence also Christians took occasion to worship Angels. And indeed, if it be once allowed as a thing lawful, that the Honour of Religion, which is due to God alone, may be given to the λόγος who is supposed to be a Created Being; I confess, I see no Reason why Angels, that in the Rank of Created Beings, may not likewise become the Objects of Divine Worship. *Gradus non mutat speciem. Religio est quæ nos religat Deo, sed non Creaturæ.*

The Jews are miserably perplexed with, and put to it, to get rid of those many Passages which in the Old Testament manifestly prove the Personality of the Holy Ghost; and labour hard to explain them of God's Actions, as of the Actions of his Will. But if once we adopt the *Arian* System, we then naturally proceed, and with *Macedonius* go on to believe, that the Holy Ghost is only a Creature of the λόγος: which Position can't but shock the Jews, to whom this Doctrine would indeed prove very

ry

ry ſerviceable, and abſolutely neceſſary to get rid of thoſe Arguments which eſtabliſh a Plurality of Perſons in the Divine Nature: Yet they dare not venture thus far on this Point: For if once a Duality (if I may ſo ſpeak) of Perſons can be proved to exiſt in the Divine Eſſence, then is it as eaſy a matter to prove the Doctrine of the Trinity. The Jews (for inſtance *R. Moſes Bar Nachman*) never attempted to place the *Memra de Jehova* in the Rank of Angels, or of Creatures; and 'tis plain that there are many Texts which ſpeak of the Meſſiah, as of the Great *Jehovah*.

The Converſion of the Jews, I confeſs, I take to be at preſent a thing almoſt impoſſible, conſidering the many Scandals that are given, and the many Stumbling-blocks that are laid before them by Chriſtians; as *v. g.* firſt by Papiſts, in that they are guilty of Idolatry in worſhipping the Hoſt, the Croſs, Angels, Saints, and what not? Then ſecondly by Proteſtants, in that they are guilty of groſs Errors, as the *Lutherans*, for inſtance, with reſpect to the Euchariſt, and by others, when they behold the Schiſms and Diviſions that reign among them, and perceive the Ignorance alſo of thoſe Men whom they diſpute with. The *Roman* Idolatry muſt neceſſarily be firſt deſtroyed, before the Jews can ever be brought over to confeſs that the Meſſiah they have vainly imagined to themſelves, is not ſpoken of in the 2d and 7th Chapters of *Daniel*, and that they themſelves alſo

e not in the least mentioned there under the enomination of *the Saints of the most High*, ho are to be employ'd by God in the Destru- ion of *Rome*. This is the only great Event at can possibly constrain them to make a ge- ral Reflection upon their great Mistakes, and gage them to study and apply themselves th a greater Care and Concern (than hither- they have done) to examine the Connec- on of the Divine Oracles, by considering e Gospel as the Accomplishment of those Ora- es, whereof they are Guardians.

I am apt to believe Mr. *Whiston* will gain but w or no Proselytes to his new Discoveries; t should God permit the contrary, it would ove new matter of Scandal to the Jews, and ll continue to harden them in their Error. he Learned amongst 'em are ever pleased with e History of the Heresies that sprang up in e Christian Church: But they are chiefly de- hted with the *Socinians*, and those more espe- lly, who pretend that Adoration is not due Christ, looking upon them to be Persons that e no Enemies, but rather Friends to them. t should *Arianism* now prevail, and get the per Hand, it is certain the Jews would there- find matter of Joy and Triumph. The *Ari- s* maintain'd, that Christ had no rational ul; pretending, that the λόγος supplied its ace, and performed all its Functions. Now is Tenet not only exposes the History of the ospel, and renders it altogether ridiculous,

but likewise hinders us from looking upon th
Messiah to be the promised *Goel*, that is, o
of our next Kinsmen, or one that hath th
Right to redeem us. And it is evident, th
Position destroys the Doctrine delivered in th
53d Chap. of *Isaiah*: And we need only peru
the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, to be convinced o
the Necessity there is of rejecting *Arius*'s D
ctrine with this Circumstance, as incompatib
with the Christian Religion.

Finally, In vain does Mr. *Whiston* boast o
having the Tradition of the antientest Fathe
on his side; for, 1. This is a matter of Fa
that will warmly be disputed with him; an
2. Tho' perhaps he may be able to instance i
some Passages out of the first Fathers, whic
are not well explain'd by *Petavius* and other
who build their Faith upon the Decision an
Determination of Councils; yet, however, h
will gain but little by this: For Protestant
and the Church of *England* particularly, whic
has received the four first General Councils, d
not rely upon the Definition of Councils, b
they receive them only because they are confor
mable to the Word of God: And therefore i
Mr. *Whiston* is willing to do any thing to th
Purpose, he must proceed after this Manne
and follow this Method. 'Tis true indeed, b
pretending that the Apostolical Constitution
are the Holy Scriptures, and their only Suppor
he does something very like it: And certainl
it must be confessed, as an unquestionable Truth
th

at the Author of those Constitutions was an
rian. But this Design of his is so whimsical,
ot to say foolish, and his Positions so absurd,
at this alone will infallibly ruin the Success
hich he so vainly promises to himself.

But there is one thing which hath struck me
his new System of Divinity; and that is,
at he has quite overturned Mr. *Mede*'s Scheme
the Prophecies of the *Revelation*, which in
at Book, publish'd in 1706, he so highly ap-
oved.

When I say that Mr. *Whiston* has quite over-
rown his own System (which is that of Mr.
lede) concerning the Revelation of Antichrist,
say no more than what he himself is obliged
confess. The Antients, as St. *Jerome* for one,
d owned that *Revelat.* xii. speaks of the Fall
the *Roman* Pagan Empire; that the great
ragon who had fall'n from Heaven, casting
t of his Mouth as it were a Flood to destroy
Church, signifies the Heresies which the De-
taught *Arius* and his Followers, after that
nstantine, the Man-child born of the Woman,
d been raised to the Empire of the World,
hich Elevation of his threw down the Dragon
om the Heaven where he was adored before
at time. Indeed the Fathers counted the first
resy to be that of *Arius*, which had several
anches; as, those of the *Eudoxians*, the *Ae-
us*, the *Eunomians*, &c. and which was con-
mned in the Person of its Author by the
ouncil of *Nice* in 325. The second was that

of *Macedonius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, con-
demn'd in the 2d General Council in 381. Th
third was that of *Nestorius*, another Bishop o
Constantinople, who in a great measure revive
the Heresy of *Paulus Samosatenus*, Bishop of *An-
tioch*, who lived in the middle of the 3d Cen-
tury. This Heresy was condemned at *Ephes*
in 431. The fourth was that of *Eutyches*, Ab
bot of a Monastery in *Constantinople*, who asser
ted, that *the Word* did not cloath it self wit
Flesh, or assume the Humane Nature in th
Womb of the Bl. Virgin; but, that the Divini
ty, being turned into Flesh, passed through th
Virgin, and was afterwards Crucify'd, died, an
was buried, and raised again on the 3d Da
This the Council of *Calcedon* condemned in 45
Those antient Writers teach, as we see fro
Theodoret, *L.* 4. *de Hæret. Fabulis*, that the En
of the World was to be expected as very nea
This *Theodoret* asserts in another place in th
same Book, speaking of the forementioned Pe
son. But now Mr. *Whiston* believes that *Ari*
was the great Reviver of the Faith of the Apo
stles; but, that St. *Athanasius* was an Innovato
who has corrupted all the Church. And no
what becomes of all his System on the *Apoc
lypse*? For, on one hand it is plain, that *M
cedonianism* is a very just and natural Conse
quent of *Arianism*: And on the other it is pla
also, that *Arius* did undoubtedly espouse th
Notions of *Paulus Samosatenus*, which *Nestori
afterwards revived*: And we know that *Eusebi*

of *Nicomedia* is esteemed a Disciple of *Lucian*, [*Colluciantsta.*] For the same *Lucian* whom the Church of *Rome* has canonized for a Saint, was certainly a Disciple of *Paulus Samosatenus*. As for *Eutyches*, his Heresy indeed was, that he denied the Humane Nature of Christ, and believ'd it turned into the Divinity: But was not this an Improvement of what he had learned in the School of *Arius*, that the *Word* supplied the Office of a reasonable Soul in Jesus Christ; and why might it not supply the room of the Body too?

It must be owned that Mr. *Mede* was much in the right in his Notion of Heresies, which were indeed the Flood that was cast out of the Mouth of the Dragon. The Interpretation is solid; and *Rupertus*, Abbot of *Duitz* in the Diocese of *Colen*, above 600 Years ago, took the first Hint of it from St. *Jerome*. And Mr. *Whiston* did well to follow Mr. *Mede*. These Heresies all arose in the Eastern Church: The West was much concerned therein. So the Devil left the East to come and bring Desolation and Confusion into the West, by corrupting the other part of the Posterity of the Woman by giving Rise to Antichristianism, which began upon the Division of the Western Empire into 10 Kingdoms. The Fathers, misled by a foolish Tradition of the Apocryphal Writers, were of Opinion that Antichrist should not reign longer than 3 Years and a half; and, that the End of the World should immediately succeed his Fall. We justly

blame their Credulity: And Mr. *Whiston* did very well to leave them, and follow Mr. *Mede*. But having since declared himself an *Arian*, from which Heresy almost all the others sprung, he would do well (as soon as he has time) to make a new Scheme on the *Revelation* agreeably to his latest Sentiments. Methinks the Opinion he has now lately embraced, should oblige him to retract publickly his *Essay on the Revelation*: Less than this will never satisfy the World. I should also think he ought to make *l'amende honorable* to the Church of *Rome*. For if he be an *Arian*, as I'm told he has been for about these 3 Years, he ought still to worship Jesus Christ: But if he is a *Dulian*, that is, according to the Account we have of that sort of *Arians*, if notwithstanding he believes the Son to be the Servant of the Father, he yet worships the Son; With what Justice can he, after Mr. *Mede*, accuse the *Romish* Church of Idolatry in Worshipping Saints and Angels, who are but the Servants of God the Father as well as Jesus Christ, tho' he perhaps be the first (of those Servants) of that Rank and Order. This is one sad and melancholy Reflexion I have made on Mr. *Whiston*'s Fall!

Another thing at which I have had Reason to be surprized in Mr. *Whiston*'s way of Writing, is, the Confidence with which he asserts That all the Antients were of *Arius*'s Opinion, and, that he can bring 100 Proofs of it. Such an unaccountable Confidence as this, is enough

o make one despair of doing any Good on a
an so full of himself, and so strongly prepos-
est. Let us however try, if it is not possible to
ake him talk more modestly. To hear the
anguage in which he affects to speak, any bo-
y would conclude he had plainly prov'd *Arius*
asius to have been an Innovator in Matters of
Religion. Good God! how came he by such
Confidence! *Eusebius* joined himself to *Arius*'s
Party, and favour'd him as much as by all his
nterest and Address he could; and perhaps he
t is who has told Mr. *Whiston* that all the An-
ients were *Arians*. No, 'tis no such thing. On
he contrary, *Eusebius* tells us of a Calumny
which some injudicious Persons had raised on
Dionysius Bishop of *Alexandria*, and which they
pread even as far as to *Rome*. They accused
im, it seems, of denying the Divinity of Je-
us Christ, that is, his Consubstantiality with
he Father, in his Refutation of the *Sabellians*.
What does *Dionysius*, Bishop of *Rome*, upon
his? Why, he obligeth the other to explain
imself upon that Point which he does with-
ot any Reluctance, and declares, that he ac-
knowledges the Son to be consubstantial with
he eternal Father. And he doth that in so ma-
y Expressions, although he doth not use the
Word ὁμοούσιος, that no body can read them
without being convinced that he understood
he Consubstantiality of the Son with the Fa-
her in the same Sense as the Fathers of the
Council of *Nice*. And we have his Letter

wherein he makes this Confession to this Day. *Athanasius* inserted it into a Discourse of his on this Subject; and so it is conveyed down safe to us. Now this shews that the Decrees of the Council of *Nice* was the received Doctrine and Faith of all true Christians. When *Arius* had published his Notions in the Parish he had the Care of, *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, deposed him for the new Doctrine he taught. We have a Relation of the Matter in a Letter he writ to *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*, where he gives him an Account of the Deposition of *Arius* a Presbyter, and of 9 Deacons who had embraced his Opinion. Afterwards the same *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, writ a circular Letter, which also we have to this Day, to all the Bishops of the World, to acquaint them, that in a Synod in *Egypt* he had condemned two Bishops, *Secundus* and *Theonas*, who had joined themselves to *Arius* who had been deposed and excommunicated. He declares in that Letter, that he looks on *Arius* his Doctrine as a Forerunner of Antichrist; and he exhorts all the Bishops of the World to hold no Communion with *Eusеb.* of *Nicomedia*, who was one of the three Bishops of *Syria* whom *Arius* had visited, and who had joined themselves to his Party, and whom he had before given a Character of, in his Letter to *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*. This Matter having made a great deal of Noise, the Emperour *Constantine* sent *Hosius* to *Alexandria*. This

Hoſius was Biſhop of *Corduba* in *Spain*: And in
. *D.* 324, he examin'd the Complaints which
e Friends of *Arius* made againſt *Alexander*.
pon the whole, *Hoſius* look'd upon *Arius* as
Heretick, and ſo left him and his Adherents
nder the Anathema denounced againſt them
Alexander his own Biſhop, and by two Sy-
ods. While three of the Biſhops of *Syria*,
d principally *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, (where
onſtantine very often reſided) were continually
king Complaints, *Conſtantine* called a Gene-
Council at *Nice*, the chief City of *Bithynia*,
A. D. 325, where *Arius* and his Friends
re heard and condemn'd, after it had been
clared agreeably to the Doctrine of *Dionyſius*
Alexandria, who flouriſhed about the mid-
of the 3d Century, that the Son was con-
ſtantial with the Father. The Depoſition of
ius and his Adherents was there confirmed,
Euſebius of *Nicomedia* was depoſed. Not
Euſebius of *Cæſarea*, the Author of the *Ec-
ſiaſtical Hiſtory*, dared to relate with what
ficulty he eſcaped the like Sentence himſelf
being an *Arian*, as appears plainly from
Books againſt *Marcellus* Biſhop of *Ancyra*.
s Confeſſion of Faith was not drawn up by
mall number of Men, but by above 300 Bi-
ps. And as *Hoſius*, who preſided in the
ncil, knew very well what was the Opinion
he *Spaniards* who lived at the other end of
ope, there were alſo preſent ſome Biſhops
Perſia and *Africa*, who witneſſed that the
Chri-

Christians in those Countries had received t
same Doctrine from their Ancestors. So th
it is impossible any Doctrine can be more u
versally condemned than that of *Arius* w
The Emperor was indeed present; but notwi
standing that, no Council ever acted with gr
ter Freedom and Liberty. *Eusebius*, as m
an *Arian* as he was, is yet obliged to confe
that the Emperour desired only that the Tr
might be discover'd and set in a clear Light,
far was he from influencing their Votes. Inde
if he had been inclined to favour one Side mo
than the other, one may guess from his Lett
to *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and to *A*
as himself, it would have been in favour of t
latter. But he had no sooner heard the Bisho
than he was convinced that *Arius* was the
novator. There was afterwards, 'tis true, so
Dispute about the Word *Consubstantial*; but th
was occasion'd by *Marcellus* Bishop of *Anc*
who gave a *Sabellian* Turn to that Word. A
cordingly, when after the Death of *Constan*
Constantius his Son, being perverted by an *A*
an Presbyter, would positively oblige the
shops of *France* and *Italy* to renounce their
cient Faith; what violent Methods was he f
ced to take at *Milan* and *Rimini*? Every bo
who has read the History of the IVth Cent
knows what Measures the Prelates of *Gaul* to
on that Occasion: They boldly defended w
St. *Hilary* of *Poitiers* (whose Books against
Arians do still remain) affirmed in Oppos

the *Eusebians* in the East, whither he had
en sent. But Mr. *Whiston* is not disturbed by
ch small Difficulties as these: He makes no
atter of the Divisions into which the *Arians*
emselves were split, tho' they were so incon-
nt, that scarce a few could assemble together
a Body, but presently they fell to drawing
a new Confession of Faith. The ordinary
ristians had a perfect Abhorrence of those
ian Assemblies. And S. *Ambrose*, speaking of
e Bishops which *Constantius* had violently
ust into many Episcopal Seats, from whence
had driven their antient Pastors, says, *The*
Ears of the People were purer than the Lips of
ir Teachers. The several *Confessions* they made
preserved to this time; and Mr. *Whiston*
uld do well to examine them with Attention,
d then inform the World on which of them
fixes, as the Symbol to be received by his
sciples. It would likewise be much for our
isfaction, if he would tell us honestly what
thinks of that Notion of *Arius's*, which was
ended by some of his Followers, That Je-
Christ had no Humane Soul, but that the
ord, which he says was created, and anima-
his Body, did also supply the Want of a
sonable Soul. Mr. *Whiston* has publish'd a
eatise of *Nestorius* concerning the Trinity,
ich he thought favour'd his Opinion. A
ned Doctor has prov'd the contrary in an
quiry into *Nestorius's* Principles. I hope he
n't take it amiss, if I put him in mind of one

Piece

Piece of History which is of no small mome
in that Controversy; and that is, That the N
tatians, who were dispers'd all over the Em
pire, and had separated from the Church upo
the appearing of *Arius*, joined with the Catho
licks at the Council of *Nice* in condemning hi
for an Heretick. They did the same at Co
stantinople. Nay and if we may believe *Socra*
and *Sozomen*, 'twas *Agellius* their Bishop at Co
stantinople who proposed the Expedient for co
vincing the *Arians* and *Macedonians*, by oppo
sing to them the Authorities of the Fathers wh
had lived in the three first Centuries. The sam
thing may be said of the *Novatists*, whose Se
paration was made before *Arius* appear'd.
think that what I have said, is sufficient to she
that Mr. *Whiston* is very much in the wrong t
affirm so positively that *Athanasius* was an Inno
vator, and that the first Council at *Nice* esta
blished a Creed contrary to the Faith which th
Church had received from the Apostles; an
that *Arius* was the only, or the principal Per
son who taught it in its Purity. If Mr. *Wh*
ston had read the Works of St. *Athanasius* wit
Judgment, he would have seen that he defe
ded the same Doctrine before *Arius* had ma
any great Noise, and which he afterwards d
fended either at the Council of *Nice*, or aft
he was made a Bishop; as may be seen in h
Discourse against the Heathens, and concer
ing the Incarnation of the Word. If he ha
proceeded farther, and read the Works of tho
wh
sent?

no writ against *Arianism*, he would have seen at the great Argument they insisted upon was is, That the Christians would be Idolaters if ey worshipped Jesus Christ, and at the same ne thought him no better than a created God. I don't at present enter into any Examination the Propositions which Mr. *Whiston* has pub-h'd concerning his new Scheme, in his *Histo-cal Preface*. He has never communicated them me, so I leave the Examination of them to e Divines to whom he shew'd them before e printed that Preface. But that he may not omplain I have not read with due Attention is Manuscripts on the *Constitutions*, I shall of-r to his Consideration two Remarks, which ay convince him, that if I differ from him bout the Antiquity of that Book, I do it for ch Reasons as ought to have weight with m, or any other reasonable Man.

The first is taken from the Fact of Rebapti-ng Hereticks, about which this Book ought all means to have been consulted, if there d been such an one in being. The 2d thing, hich I don't remember Mr. *Whiston* has taken y notice of, is this, and which one would pect should have been perfectly clear'd up by Professor of the Mathematicks in the famous niversity of *Cambridge*; and indeed it is such one, as must needs convince any Reader who oes but give a little more Attention in the udy of this Matter than Mr. *Whiston* seems to ave made use of in framing his System: It is this;

this; that whereas he asserts that *Clemens R*
manus left in the Church of *Rome* the Book
the *Apostolical Constitutions*, to serve for a R
unto the Church for her Doctrine, Rites, a
Discipline; this Notion is a meer Chimera, a
the Invention of a very fruitful, but ill-gover
and injudicious Fancy: For else we must su
pose that the Bishops of *Rome*, to whom th
sacred *Depositum* was committed, kept it till
ter the Council of *Nice* without ever consulti
it on the most weighty Occasions, or ever co
municating it to any Person. We find that u
der *Agrippin*, Bishop of *Carthage*, it was reso
ved in a Council of *Africa*, to rebaptize all th
Hereticks without Distinction. *Tertullian*, wh
was then a Catholick, is an unexceptionabl
Witness of this matter of Fact, since he writ
Discourse in Greek concerning the rebaptizi
of Hereticks, to justify the Resolution of th
Council of *Africa*, as he informs us in his La
tin Discourse *De Baptismo*. He writ that Di
course in Greek for the Use of the Christia
in the East, who were disputing about tha
Matter. Indeed it is not unlikely, that it wa
of Service to the Bishops who assembled at *Sy*
node, of whom *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* spea
in *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 7. c. 7.* The same *Di*
onysius tells us of a Council at *Iconium*, bu
which appears to be held later than the othe
because *Firmilian*, Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappa*
docia, presided in it at the same time when *Di*
onysius of *Alexandria* flourished. And that Coun
c

at *Iconium* followed the Footsteps of the o-
r at *Synade*. So that we find there were
ee Councils held on this Question, one in
ica, and two in *Asia*, before ever S. *Cyprian*
d *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* enter'd into a Dis-
e about it. Now 'tis certain that the *Constitu-*
ions determine this Question *lib.* 6. *c.* 16. ac-
ding to the Mind of those three Councils,
d that they order'd the Rebaptizing of all
retick*s* when they return into the Commu-
n of the Catholick Church. But it can't be
pposed that so many Bishops, both in *Asia*
d *Africa*, should have known of these Con-
utions, because they never quote them in
fence of their Judgment and Practice; which
ely they would have done if *Clement* had
r committed them to the Church of *Rome*,
the directing of the Church in Faith, and
es, and Discipline. That Council of *Africa*
s held under *Agrippin*, before the Year 200;
d the Practice there establish'd, was constant-
bserved afterwards in the Churches of *Afri-*
as S. *Cyprian* tells us in his Epistle to *Juba-*
s, and in another to *Quintus*. Nor did
t Council consist of only a small Number of
hops: For S. *Augustin*, in his Book *de unico*
pt. contra Petil. tells us, that there were as-
bled to the number of Seventy. And the
o Councils of *Synade* and *Iconium* must also
ve been very full: Thus much at least is
tain, that there were present at them, Bishops
m several Provinces of *Asia*. And what is

more

more than all this, till the time of *Stephen*, t
Church of *Rome* had constantly received
Hereticks without rebaptizing them. 'Tis i
deed very strange she should have done so, sin
there were at *Rome* the Followers of *Valenti*
Cerdon, and *Marcion*; the Principles of whi
Hereticks, quite overturned the very fund
mental Articles of the Christian Religion. Y
that Pope had a very sharp Dispute with *Cyp*
an on this Question, and condemned the Custo
of the Churches of *Africa*, tho' it was agre
able to the Decision of the Apostles in the
Constitutions. Nor did any Person in the *R*
man Church advise him that he was disputi
against the Apostles, whose Constitutions we
in the Treasury of that Church. The *Africa*
on the other hand, were very well satisfy'd
their own Custom, which was agreeable to t
Decision of their Ancestors, and never argue
from the Authority of those Constitution
which must certainly have put *Stephen* and h
Party to the utmost Confusion. And *Dionys*
of *Alexandria*, when he saw *Stephen* was so o
stinate, as to declare he would excommunic
the Churches of *Cilicia*, *Cappadocia*, *Galati*
and some other Churches of *Asia*, that rebapt
zed all the Hereticks; but never thought of u
ging against him the *Constitutions of the Apostl*
which favour'd the Practice of those Church
He only said, that Rebaptization of Heretic
was establish'd by three great Synods; and
he recover'd to a Spirit of Love and Pea
tho

ſe who with *Stephen* had been for breaking
Communion with thoſe Churches. Mr. *Whi*,
is certainly at liberty to believe and fanſy
t he pleaſes; but I don't think he can ever
ſwade any Man of Senſe, that after a Pra-
e of this nature has been the Subject of a
ntroverſy for near 60 Years, and between
greateſt Churches, it can be poſſible that
a Book as the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, in
ich the Matter is clearly decided, ſhould have
n in being, and, what is more, firſt com-
ted to the Church at *Rome* to be commu-
ated unto all the Chriſtian Biſhops, in all
ts of the World, for the regulating their
h, their Rites, and their Diſcipline. But
is not all: The ſame Queſtion was in 325
erred to the Council of *Nice*; and what is
e ſtrange, is their deciding it contrary to
Determination of the Apoſtles in their ſup-
ed Conſtitutions. For the Council, with-
diſgracing *Stephen*, condemns his Opinion
he Preſence, and even with the Conſent,
is own Legats. That Pope, it ſeems, was
the receiving equally all Hereticks, with-
rebaptizing any; but the Council orders,
at the Followers of *Paul*, Biſhop of *Antioch*,
o deny'd the Deity of Chriſt, ſhould be re-
tized, *Can.* 19. So that here we ſee one of
greateſt Aſſemblies of Biſhops that has ever
n ſeen, is entirely ignorant of theſe Conſti-
ons of the Apoſtles, and decides contrary
hem. Neither the Legats of Pope *Silveſter*,

who had the keeping of so valuable a Treasu
nor the Bishops of the greatest Churches in t
World who were there present, and whose P
decessors ought all to have received Copies
the Constitutions, never speak one Syllable
them. Whereas, according to Mr. *Whiston*, th
ought to have had 'em, in a manner, all
heart, having been educated and formed und
the Doctrine and Instruction contained in th
Let us see somewhat that is yet more surp
zing: Though the Council of *Nice* settled t
Point, yet we must not conclude that all t
Dioceses of the Church did acquiesce in th
Decision. S. *Basil* tells us, that *Cappadocia*,
which he was Metropolitan, kept to its anti
Custom of rebaptizing all the Hereticks, b
without ever alledging that they disobey'd t
Council of *Nice* out of Deference to the co
trary Determination of the Apostles. The *Ap*
stolical Constitutions having appear'd before t
End of the IVth Century, the Question of r
baptizing Hereticks was revived with a gr
deal of Warmth in *Africa*. S. *Augustin* wri
don't know how many Discourses on that A
gument, because the *Donatists* rebaptized tho
who join'd themselves to their Communio
Ursin, an *African* Monk, tells us, in a Discour
publish'd by the learned *Rigaltius*, in his Not
on *Cyprian*, that several Bishops in *Africa* we
inclined to rebaptize Hereticks: but yet aft
all, though the Book of the Constitutions h
then been published from the time of *Epip*
ni

, who quotes a Paſſage out of it; we don't
that any Uſe was made of it in the Diſ-
es on that Subject.

This is my firſt Obſervation; which is, of
elf, ſufficient to overturn all Mr. *Whiſton* has
rted concerning the Antiquity of the Con-
utions, which ſeem to have been written
e Years after the Condemnation of *Arius*.

come now to the ſecond, which I deſire
Whiſton to conſider attentively.

ſhould readily pardon Mr. *Whiſton*'s Conje-
e about the Sincerity of the *Apoſtolical Con-
tions* which appear'd before the middle of
IVth Century, if he were altogether igno-
of ſeveral Queſtions about which the Anti-
were divided in their Opinions for ſeve-
Ages. The Queſtion about *Eaſter* is one,
ich occaſion'd a long and ſharp Diſpute.
Importance of the Matter was not ſo great
o deſerve it; yet this is very nicely decided
he *Conſtitutions*, *lib.* 5. *c.* 16. The Words
theſe: "*Oportet ergo fratres ut qui pretioſo
hriſti ſanguine redempti eſtis, dies feſtos Paſ-
æ accuratè & omni diligentia poſt æquinoctii-
m celebretis, ut neque unius paſſionis bis per
nnum memoriam renovetis, ſed potius ſemel
notannis memoriam mortui item ſemel cele-
retis: Neque amplius cum Judæis tempus cele-
randi paſcha obſervetis; nulla enim nobis nunc
um eis communitas eſt. Falluntur namque in
ſo etiam Calculo & ratiocinatione, quam exi-
imant ſe abſolvere, ut ex omni parte à veri-*

" *tate abstracti sint: Vos vero observate diligent*
" *conversionem verni æquinoctii, quæ incidit*
" 22^m *diem Mensis* 12^i *qui appellatur* Dystro
" *& notate, atque ad* 21^m *Lunam, ne in illa*
" *hebdomadam incidat luna quartadecima;*
" *per errorem bis unoque anno pascha agitem*
" *aut diem Resurrectionis Domini nostri alio*
" *præterquam Dominico celebremus.*

Let us consider a little Mr. *Whiston*'s Syste concerning this Book of the *Constitutions*. 1. H supposes that *Clement*, Disciple of S. *Paul*, w Author of it. 2. That he composed it in th 64th Year of Christ, after an Assembly of th Apostles conven'd for that purpose. 3. Th he deposited this Book with the Church *Rome*, of which he was Bishop, to serve for Rule of Faith, Manners, and Discipline, to th Church.

But there are several other Events to be co sidered; namely, That there arose a Questio about *Easter* before the middle of the secon Century. *Polycarp*, who dy'd *A. D.* 147, we to *Rome*, under Pope *Eleutherus*, to endeavo to make up that Difference: But *Eleutherus* ha not the sense to shew the Decision made by th Apostles, as it was related by *Clement*, one his Predecessors.

The same Controversy broke out again unde *Victor*: But he, poor Man, had never seen heard of the Book of the *Constitutions*; else that he might soon have put an End to th Dispute. But he being desirous of getting S tisfactio

sfaction himself, and of being able to satisfy thers who were sadly divided by that Que-ion, writ to *Theophilus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*: *Theophilus*, upon receiving that Letter, calls a Council, not only of the Bishops of *Palestine*, ut also of several other Countries in the Year 96; and what Answer does he return to *Vi-tor*? Why just the contrary to that which *Cle-ent* gives as the Judgment of the Apostles: or, 1. He lays down, that Jesus Christ arose he 25th of *March*, being *Sunday*, and that he ied the 23d of *March*. 2. Thereupon he lays own the Rule related by *Beda*: "*Constitutum est ergo in illa Synodo, ut ab xi. Kal. Aprilis usque ad xi. Kal. Maii Pascha debeat observari; & nec antè nec postea cuicumque constitutum limitem transgredi sit fas. Similiter & de Luna præceptum Dominicum teneatur, quod mandatum est per Moysem. Sit vobis observata à quartadecima Luna usque ad 21. Has ergo octo Lunas, similiter in Paschate tenendo constat fuisse consecratas: Quando ergo sit intra illum limitem ab xi. Kal. Aprilis, usque in xi. Kal. Maii, Dies Dominicus & Luna ex illis octo sanctificata est, Pascha nobis jussum est celebrare.* The learned *Bucherius* read the Decision of his Council under the Name of that of *Philippi*, nd did not discover that it was the very Let-er of *Theophilus* to *Victor*. *Beda*, from whom e have this Council of *Cæsarea*, acquaints us ith the Occasion of this Letter of *Victor*, and lls us, 1. That the Apostles had determin'd

nothing about this Matter; which ſhews, th
the Weſtern Church, down to the eighth Ce
tury, had never received the Book of the *C*
ſtitutions. 2. That the Celebration of *Eaſ*
had been very different; for the *Gauls* kept
on the 25th of *March*, in Memory of the R
ſurrection, let it fall on what Day of the We
it would. 2. In *Italy*, where one would thi
they ſhould have known ſomewhat of the *Ap*
ſtolical Conſtitutions, they always kept it on t
25th of *March*; but differed about the Numb
of the Days of the Faſt they obſerved before
3. That in the Eaſt they kept it the 14th of t
Moon of *March*. 4. That *Victor* thought fit t
apply himſelf to *Theophilus* the Metropolit
of *Paleſtine* p. 469. "*Ut quamodo Paſcha re*
"*jure à cunctis Catholicis celebretur Eccleſi*
"*inibi fieret ordinatio, ubi Dominus & Salvat*
"*Mundi fuerat in carne verſatus.* We find th
after this Determination of the Council of *C*
ſarea, *Victor* was ſo poſitive and inflexible in
Matter of ſo little Importance, that he was g
ing to Excommunicate all the Churches of *Aſ*
if S. *Irenæus* had not oppoſed it, and brough
him to a more reaſonable Temper. Since th
time we ſee nothing but different Cycles fo
med by ſeveral learned Men for regulating *E*
ſter-Day. *Hippolytus* made one of 112 Yea
under *Alexander Severus.* *Anatolius*, Biſhop
Laodicea in *Syria*, made another ſome 50 Yea
after; yet the *Latins* generally followed th
Cycle of the Jews, of which we have a Deſcr
ptio

tion in S. *Epiphanius*, *Hæref.* 51. The Deſign which thoſe learned Men propoſed, was to give the Church ſuch a certain Computation for that Feſtival, as might ſerve to reconcile the different Parties, and keep 'em from following the Cycle of the Jews. If it is poſſible that *Anatolius* might never have ſeen the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, at leaſt one would think that *Hippolytus*, who died near *Rome*, ſhould doubtleſs have ſeen them: But we don't find he ever had; nay, on the contrary, we are very ſure he never ſo much as heard of any ſuch Book.

In the middle of the III[d] Century they began to make Hereticks of all thoſe who kept *Eaſter* on the 14th of the Moon without waiting for the Day of the Reſurrection, nor minding whether that 14th Day fell on the 3d, 5th, or even the 7th Day of the Week. Theſe latter pretended, 1. S. *John*'s Authority, whoſe Custom it had been in the Churches of *Aſia*. They produced the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and other Apocryphal Pieces, as *Theodoret* calls them *lib. de Hær. Fabul.* There was never a better time, and which would have been more ſerviceable to the Intereſt of the Biſhops of *Rome*, to have produced the *Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles*, than this; eſpecially ſince the others urged the Tradition of S. *John*, and *the ſpurious Acts of the Apoſtles*: And yet we don't hear one word of their being produced againſt them on ſo fair an Occaſion.

At length this Matter is brought to the Coun
cil of *Nice*, through the Remonſtrances tha
Conſtantine made to both the contending Par
ties. That Prince was much diſturbed at th
Difference between the Churches of *Aſia* an
the others, which he had known before: So h
writes to all thoſe Churches, and particularl
exhorts thoſe who followed the Cycle of th
Jews, according to which *Eaſter* was ſometime
celebrated twice in one Year, to conform them
ſelves to the general and ordinary Cuſtom
This we learn from *Euſebius*'s Hiſtory, *Lib.*
c. 17, 18. Was there ever a more natural Oc
caſion of alledging the *Apoſtolical Conſtitution*
than this? And yet not one of all the 318 Bi
ſhops of whom that Council conſiſted, eve
once mentioned that Book. Nay, we find fro
the Writings of ſome who lived after the mid
dle of the IVth Century, as S. *Ambroſe*, *Epiſt.* 8
that that Council referred to the Church o
Alexandria the care of ſettling *Eaſter-Day*, wit
an Injunction to notify the time to all the chie
Biſhops of the Empire. A Sign they though
that Aſtronomy was better underſtood ther
than in any other Church in the Empire; an
that therefore 'twas thought beſt to follow th
Rule which ſhould be ſettled by them of tha
Church.

Nor is it only from the utter Silence of al
the Authors who writ on the Subject of th
Paſſover, that we conclude the *Apoſtolical Con
ſtitutions* were never known till the time o
S. *Epi*

. *Epiphanius*, who writ towards the Year 375, nd that they were forged a little before that ather flouriſhed, and after the Council of *Nice*. ut even the very Deciſion which is made in hem, ſhews that the Author could not live in he time of S. *Clement*. The Words of the De- iſion are quoted above. I am amazed Mr. *Whi- on* ſhould not perceive, 1. That this preten- ed *Clement* puts a Conſtitution upon the Apo- les which is perfectly oppoſite to that of St. *aul*, who blames the *Galatians* for *obſerving ays*, &c. 2. He makes the Apoſtles ignorant hen the Equinox fell in their time; for it was ot on the 22d of *March*, as this Impoſtor akes them ſuppoſe, but on the 23d. 3. He rgot to make the Apoſtles put out a new Cy- e, that might be more perfect than that which e Jews uſed. His Courage fail'd him here, elſe he wanted Skill to draw one up. For he as confounded by the different Cycles which e Fathers of the III^d Century had invented. nd yet the thing was abſolutely neceſſary, d would have ſaved the Greek and Latin hurch infinite Pains. For after the Council *Nice*, all the learned Men were taken up in ntriving ſuch an one. Nay and the Church *Rome* fell often into the very ſame Inconve- ence which the Council of *Nice* endeavour'd prevent, I mean that of celebrating the riſtian Paſſover on the ſame Day on which e Jews kept theirs. 4. That the Author of e Conſtitutions has fixed the Vernal Equinox according

according to the Obſervations of thoſe wh
diſputed a little after *Victor* againſt the *Quart*
decimans. They fixed it to the 22d of *Marc*
anticipating a Day from the time of S. *Clemen*
They were preſt with a Difficulty which appea
at firſt ſight; *i. e.* That by fixing the *Paſſo*
of Jeſus Chriſt, *i. e.* his Reſurrection, on *Mar*
25, they muſt ſometimes keep *Eaſter* twice i
one Year. For by following the Kalendar o
Lunar Months according to the Jewiſh Cycl
they were obliged to keep the ſecond befor
the Equinox following, unleſs they did inte
calate 11 Days every Year, and 12 Days ever
4th Year, or *Biſſextil*. For if *Clement* had ſe
tled the *Equinox*, he would not have fixed i
on the 22d of *March*; becauſe in his time i
did not fall on the 22d, but on the 23d o
that Month: It did not fall on the 22d till a
bove 100 Years after his Death. To conclud
If Mr. *Whiſton* had compared this Chapter o
the *Conſtitutions*, he would immediately hav
obſerved, that this Impoſtor, who conceal'
himſelf under the Name of *Clement*, follows th
Reaſons which *Conſtantine* urges in his Epiſt
to the Churches, which *Euſebius* recites in th
Place above-quoted, to ſhew what an Abſu
dity thoſe Churches were guilty of, who fo
lowed the Jews Kalendar-Computation.

It is very plain, from what has been alre
dy obſerved, that Mr. *Whiſton* has not read th
Eccleſiaſtical Writers with much Judgment o
Attention; nay, and that he has made litt
U

Uſe of that ſort of Learning which he beſt underſtands, I mean the Mathematicks; for, if he had made that Uſe of thoſe Sciences which he might have done, he could never have paſſed ſo raſh a Judgment concerning the Author of the *Conſtitutions*, as he has been led to by his new Scheme. We'll paſs by his Rudeneſs to S. *Matthew*, whom he has ſerved little better than *Medea* did *Æſon*: And as he has taken upon him the Character of a Chronologer, let us ſhew that by his Hypotheſis in Chronology he has made a ſhift to confound the cleareſt and moſt certain Matters of Fact.

How unhappy he is at making Hypotheſes, we have an Inſtance in the Diſſertation he has publiſh'd at the End of his *Eſſay on the Apocalypſe*, concerning the *Abiathar* of whom Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaks *Matt.* II. 25, 26. Divines eſteem themſelves obliged to defend what our Saviour there aſſerts againſt the Objections of the Jews. Indeed it is plain, that the Fact our Saviour ſpeaks of, was done under *Abimelech* the High Prieſt, and not under *Abiathar* his Son (who fled from *Nob* to *David*, and carry'd with him the *Ephod* to which the *Urim* was faſten'd) after his Father was killed by *Saul* among the 85 Prieſts who were at *Nob*: But to this Difficulty there are many Anſwers given, which may ſatisfy any reaſonable Perſon. S. *Jerome* thought that the Copyiſts might have put the Name of *Abiathar* inſtead of *Abimelech*, which we find in 1 *Sam.* xxii. and that either through

Miſtake,

Miſtake, or becauſe he might alſo be called *Abiathar*. *Beza* thought that both the Father and the Son might have two Names; and proves his Opinion, by comparing 2 *Chron.* xxiv. 2, 3, 6. and 2 *Sam.* viii. 17. with 2 *Sam.* xv. 29, 35. and 1 *Kings* ii. 26. *Camerarius* thought that the Prepoſition בימי, *under Abiathar*, is ſo general a Mark of Time, that it might agree well enough to ſomewhat that paſſed indeed under *Abimelech*, but within a few Days of the Prieſthood of *Abiathar*, who was the more famous Man of the two; eſpecially if, as *Nicholas de Lyra* conjectured, *Abiathar* had even then actually engaged in the Prieſtly Office. Any of theſe Anſwers is ſufficient to remove the Jews Objection: For Jeſus Chriſt mentions *Abiathar* becauſe he was the more noted Man. *Abimelech* was executed as a Traitor to *Saul*, and to the State. And then, 2. It is not to be ſuppoſed that *Abimelech* gave *David* the *Shewbread* with his own Hands, but that it was given him by *Abiathar*, by the Order of *Abimelech*, who lived but a few Days after. *Procopius* of *Gaza*, p. 68, lays down ſome other Conjectures upon this place of S. *Mark*, which Mr. *Whiſton* might have made uſe of, if he had known of them; though 'tis true indeed, that they have been rejected by the beſt Commentators. Yet Mr. *Whiſton*, it ſeems, was not ſatisfied with any of the Anſwers he had met with: And as he had ſomewhere found an old Catalogue of the High Prieſts of the Race of

Eli, which no body had ever ſeen before him, e has formed his Conjectures upon that, as oldly as if he had received an expreſs Reve-tion on this Point. 1. He tells us, that the *himelech* who was ſlain at *Nob* with the 84 rieſts, was not the High Prieſt, but that the igh Prieſt's Name was *Abiathar*, and of this lan (if we may take Mr. *Whiſton*'s Word for) our Saviour ſpeaks. This *Abiathar* I. was he Son of *Ahijah*. So that Mr. *Whiſton* makes wo *Abiathars*; under the firſt of whom, he oncludes from S. *Mark*, *David* eat the *Shew-read*: The ſecond, he ſays, was the Grandſon f the firſt, and the Son of one *Ahimelech* an igh Prieſt. 2. That *Eli* and ſeven Perſons of is Race were High Prieſts, in this Order, *Eli*, *hineas*, *Ahitub*, *Ahijah*, *Abiathar* I. *Ahimelech*, *biathar* II. *Jonathan*. A very conſiderable iſcovery this is! Poor *Joſephus*, the Jewiſh iſtorian, who too was himſelf a Prieſt, knew but 13 High Prieſts from *Aaron* to *Solomon*, ntiq. l. 20. c. 8. and they were, *Aaron*, *Elea-r*, *Phineas*, *Abiezer*, *Phineas*, *Buchi*, *Hoſi*, *li*, *Ahitub*, *Ahias*, *Ahimelech*, *Jehojada*, *Sadoc*. e knew nothing of two *Abiathars*. So the *ws*, particularly *Rabbi David Kimchi*, conclude *hojada* was an High Prieſt from 1 *Chron.* xii. 7. *And Jehojada was the Leader of the* Aaro-*tes*, *&c.* And they take him to have been the me with *Abiathar* the Son of *Ahimelech*. *Jo-hus* (Antiq. l. 6. c. 14. p. 196.) innocently pposes, that *Ahimelech* was an High Prieſt,

and

and brings him in confessing before *Saul*, th
he had consulted God for *David*, as he h
done on other Occasions. He also takes notic
that the Slaughter of the Descendants of E
was an Accomplishment of *Samuel*'s Prophe
against that House. He affirms also, that *A*
thar the Son of *Abimelech* the High Priest, w
the only Person who escaped from the Fu
of *Saul*. And when he comes to *Lib.* 8. *c.*
p. 254. where he speaks of *Solomon*'s Depos
Abiathar, he takes notice that *Abiathar* and *S*
dec had been made High Priests by *David*, a
that *Solomon* spared *Abiathar*'s Life on the A
count of what he had gone through in *David*
Service, and because he had borne the Ark b
fore him. And there again he observes, th
by the Deposition of *Abiathar*, *Samuel*'s Pr
phecy against the House of *Eli* was perfect
fulfilled. I know that there are Differences
the List of the 13 High Priests: some cou
them thus; *Aaron*, *Eleazar*, *Phinees*, *Abish*
Bocci, *Hosi*, *Zeruchia*, *Meraioth*, *Amaria*, (
Joseph. Ant. *lib.* 8. *c.* 1. *p.* 254.) those are t
9 before *Eli*, after whom come *Ahitub*, *Abij*
Abimelech. Thus *Josephus*'s Number of 13 Hi
Priests is filled up. But we are obliged
Mr. *Whiston* for increasing the Number to 1
for that, if I am not mistaken, is the Sum
9 and 8; and for acquainting us that the
were two *Abiathars*; under the first of who
he supposes that Affair of the *Shewbread*
have happen'd, wisely foreseeing that it co
n

be referr'd to the time of the second.
We need not look far for the Reason of Mr.
Whiston's making such strange and unheard-of
oppositions. He tells us, in his Chronology,
t *Saul* reigned 40 Years. The great *Usher*
s of that Opinion; yet almost all Chrono-
gers are of another Mind. But Mr. *Whiston*
follow'd him in his Mistake, for want of
mining the thing. He pretends to prove it
m *Acts* xiii. 19, 20, 21. But S. *Paul*, in that
ce, does not give 40 Years to *Saul* alone,
to *Samuel* and *Saul*. *Samuel* was born in
the Pontificate of *Eli*, who judged the Peo-
40 Years, and died at the Age of 98. S.
el judged them above 20 Years after *Eli* be-
e he beat the *Philistines*; after that he judg-
them several Years; but as he grew old
here by the way, the Word signifies a Man
t is past his 60th Year) he fixed his Sons in
Place: They, not being immediately under
ir Father's Eye, abused their Authority to
that the People ask for a King. *Samuel*
Order from God to set one over them;
accordingly he Anointed *Saul* at the End
the Summer, 1 *Sam.* xii. 17. *Samuel* then
res to his House, and there remains till the
Day, having charg'd King *Saul* to wait for
n, in order to offer up a solemn Sacrifice.
athan, *Saul*'s Son, having in the mean time
cessfully attack'd a Host of the *Philistines*,
assemble their Troops at *Mikmash*, where-
Saul was obliged to hasten the Sacrifice be-

fore

fore the 7th Day was expired, contrary to S
muel's Direction. This was *Saul*'s first S
However, God granted them two Victories,
the Conduct of *Jonathan*, *Saul*'s Son and
General of his Army, a few Days after wa
The *Moabites*, *Ammonites*, and other nei
bouring Nations, seeing that the new King
not yet well settled in his Throne, they prep
to invade his Dominions; but were repuls
after some unsuccessful Attempts made in
depth of Winter. After this, *Samuel*, by Go
Authority, obliged *Saul* to destroy the *Am*
kites, 1 Sam. xv. Accordingly he destro
them about the Month of *January*; But in
Matter he did not fulfil the divine Comma
and so was told by *Samuel*, that God had
jected him from being King. *Samuel*, on th
was commanded to Anoint *David*: A
which, *Saul* was troubled with an evil Spi
and sent for *David*, to cure him by sing
Holy Songs. In the mean time, the *Philist*
insult the *Israelites* in their Camp for 40 D
together; But *David* killed their Champi
Goliah, and so was the Occasion of gainin
great Victory over them. *Saul* gave his Dau
ter to *David* according to his Promise,
made him one of his Generals; but, with
Design to get rid of him. So *David* was
ced to fly, 1. to *Rama*, where he met with
muel, who dy'd a little while after; then 2.
repairs unto *Nob* to *Ahimelech*, who gave
the Shewbread; 3. to *Achish*, whom he qu

left, fearing lest he should pay for his Victory over *Goliah* with his own Life; 4. into the Cave of *Adullam*; 5. into one of the Strongholds of *Moab*; 6. into the Forest of *Hereth*. At the end of *April*, which was the time when they sheer'd their Sheep in *Judea*, the *Philistines* fought against *Keilah*, and *David* lay hid in the Desart of *Ziph*, and after in that of *Maon*, then in that of *Engaddi*, and last of all in that of *Ziph* again. About this time *Samuel* dy'd, as likewise *Nabal* a little after, whose Widow *David* married. As *Saul* try'd all ways possible to seize *David*, he thought fit to retire to *Achish* King of the *Philistines*, in whose Dominions he remain'd a Year and four Months according to the express words of Scripture, and that was till the Death of *Saul* his more Enemy.

If Mr. *Whiston* had throughly considered this History, he would have concluded, that the Scripture, which says that *Saul* reigned but two Years, is rather to be believed than those Christian Chronologers who, after *Josephus*, have given his Reign such a length as is absolutely impossible it should have had, I say *impossible*, because 'tis certain that *Saul* was rejected the first Year of his Reign, and that *David* was a little after anointed in his place by *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* xiii. 1. *&c.* Besides, it's certain that *David* was thirty Years old when he succeeded *Saul*, 2 *Sam.* v. 4. From

whence it would follow, according to
Whiston, that he came to the Crown 9 Ye
before he was born, if *Saul* reigned 40 Ye
2. I affirm, that the Paſſage in 1 *Sam.* xxvi
is well tranſlated in the *Engliſh* Bible, th
And the time that David *dwelt in the L*
of the Philiſtines *was a full Year and f*
Months, as appears from *Achiſh* his Wor
Chap. xxix. 3. where he counts two Ye
begun, for two entire Years: *Is not this* D
vid, *who hath been with me theſe Days or th*
Years? In which Words he repreſents to t
Lords of the *Philiſtines*, *David*'s Faithfuln
in his Service. 3. It's impoſſible to make a
thing of thoſe Words of *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* xxiv. 2
Swear that thou wilt not cut off my Seed af
me, &c. unleſs we confeſs, that *Saul* w
pretty old when he was made King. For
his Death he left *Iſhboſheth* his Heir 40 Ye
old: And yet *Jonathan* was his eldeſt So
not the other. 4. How can we underſta
the Words of *David* to *Abiſhai*, who wou
have had him kill *Saul* in his Tent, wh
he had ſurprized him without any Guar
Chap. xxvi. 10. *Or his day ſhall come to d*
Do they not plainly referr to the natu
Death of *Saul*, which *David* thought co
not be far off by reaſon of his great Ag
5. What elſe can *Jonathan* mean, when a
he had acknowledged that God had appoi
ed *David* to be King of *Iſrael*, he deſires h
to be kind to his Family? Some learned M
belie

lieve that *Saul*'s great Age is ſignified by the
ly Writer, when he calls him *Ben ſhana*,
t is, a Man who has lived many Years:
ich Place the Commentators have not un-
ſtood: nay, ſome of them have imagin'd,
t the Copyiſts forgot to ſpecify the Num-
of Years; for they ſuppoſe, but falſly,
t formerly the Numbers were not expreſſed
length, but by the numeral Letters.
But let us try if we can't convince Mr. *Whi-*
of his Error. He confeſſes, that there
re 300 Years from *Moſes*'s conquering of
Land beyond *Jordan*, to the time of *Jeph-*
And from thence it follows, that there
be but 180 Years from the firſt Year of
phtha to the fourth of *Solomon* inclusively.
us then count 4 Years of *Solomon*, 40 of
vid, 40 of *Saul*, 25 of *Samuel* and his Sons,
of *Eli*. Theſe Sums make up 149 Years.
ell, according to Mr. *Whiſton*, *Sampſon* judg-
20 Years before *Eli*: The *Philiſtines* held
People in Bondage 40 Years, *Abdon* judg-
8 Years, *Elon* 10, *Ibſan* 7, *Jephtha* 6.
heſe 6 numbers together make 91 Years, which
th the former 149 make 240 Years, that is
Years more than there ought to be be-
een the firſt of *Jephtha* and the fourth of
lomon.
Two Faults which have been committed,
e by the Jewiſh, and the other by the
riſtian Copyiſts, have perfectly confounded
e Chronologers. The firſt was committed

by the Jewish Copyists in *Judges* iii. 30. where we find 80 Years given to *Ehud*, whereas the Holy Writer writ no more than 8; which the very Number *Theophilus Antiochenus* read in his Copy of the Greek Version: In solving this Doubt, the Chronologers have sweat, nay, the Difficulty has confounded them, that they have not seen what is very plain, that from the Division of *Canaan* by *Joshua* there are exactly 350 Years to the first of *Samuel*. 'Tis amazing that *Marsham*, who invented a new Scheme to solve this Difficulty, should never have considered what *Jacobus Capellus* has written on this Subject in his *Historia Sacra & Exotica*; and that he should not see, that making the Judges and the Bondages to be together, can be of no manner of use from the first of *Joshua*, after which his Method must be admitted. Not that I approve of *Capellus*'s Criticism on the Hebrew Style, by which he pretends, that without changing *Shemonim*, as now we read it, for *Shemonah*, we may translate this first word *eight*.

The other Fault has been committed by the Christian Copyists in Acts xiii. 19, 20. a place which Mr. *Nelson* has taken a great deal of pains about, and all without being able to clear it up. For as he reads the Text, it does in that place make an Interval of 450 Years between the Division of the Land by *Joshua*, which happen'd 1450 Years before

Christ,

rist, and the first Year of *Samuel*. Now if is reading of the Verse be true, the Passage the first to *Kings* must necessarily be false, cause there no more than 480 Years ac unted from the time when the *Israelites* nt out of *Egypt*, to the 4th of *Solomon*. e Mr *Whiston* did not observe that there s another reading of the Place, and that ore antient too than the common one, since is is entirely owing to the Rashness of some pyists. But according to this antient read ng, the Number of Years is not 450, but 0. Now by this Account, the first of *Saul* will fall on the Year 1100 before Christ, d the Year of the Foundation of the Tem e being the 480th from the going out of *pt*, will fall on the 1076th before Christ. ow let us take 4 Years of *Solomon*, 40 of *avid*, and 40 of *Saul*, according to Mr. *Whi*, there we have 84 Years, on the first of hich *Saul*'s Reign must begin, because that on the 1084th before Christ. But then what ll become of all *Samuel*'s time who be *Philistines*, the 20th of 23 Year of his dging the People? What will become of e Time when he Judged alone? And what the Time when his two Sons were Judges ith him? Did they begin to abuse their wer as soon as it was given them? Did the ople immediately demand a King? And did d immediately give *Samuel* Commission to oint *Saul*,

To ſpeak freely, almoſt all the Chriſti
Chronologers have here been led aſide by
ſephus, whom they thought a great Chrono
ger. But the Jewiſh Commentators, *Ra*
Levi ben Gerſom and *Abarbanel* only excepte
have adher'd to the Account in 1 *Sam.* xiii.
which makes *Saul* to have reign'd but t
Years, reckoning them from his ſecond
ointing.

Samuel began to Judge *Iſrael* after t
Death of *Eli*, who had held from the
Year of *Aelon* through the Remainder of
time, through all the Judicature of *Abd*
during the Apoſtacy of *Iſrael*, which la
eight Years, and through the 18 firſt Ye
of *Iſrael*'s Slavery under the *Philiſtines*.
beat the *Philiſtines* in the 22d or 23d Y
of his Government, which was in 1078
fore Chriſt. And as for what S. *Paul* ſa
that *Samuel* and *Saul* govern'd *Iſrael* 40 Ye
that is very exact: For under *Samuel*'s N
his two Sons are alſo comprehended, toget
with the two Years of the Reign of *S*
David ſucceeded *Saul* in 1060 before Chr
Samuel having been dead the Year bef
Now beginning the firſt of *Samuel* on
Year 1100 before Chriſt, the 40 Years fi
exactly at 1060 before Chriſt.

Theſe things being thus ſolidly prov
all Mr. *Whiſton*'s Conjectures and Propoſiti
vaniſh away into Smoak. There were
eight High Prieſts of the Race of *Itha*

Eli. There could be no two *Abiathars*, nd all the other Diſcoveries which Mr. *Whi-on* advanceth with ſuch Aſſurance, are equal-groundleſs.

1. Mr. *Whiſton's* Notion that *Abimelech*, ho was ſlain by *Saul* with 84 Prieſts, was ot an High Prieſt; is contrary to what *Jo-hus*, and all Commentators after him, have erted. 2. His Suppoſition that *Abiathar*, *bimelech's* Son, who fled to *David* after the eath of his Father, was never High Prieſt, utterly falſe, by the Conſent of *Joſephus*, d all Commentators, as well *Chriſtians* as *ws*. When he aſſerts that *Abimelech* and *iathar* his Son, being only called Prieſts, n neither of them have been High Prieſt; is only ſhews him not to underſtand the yle of the Scripture. As for what he affirms, at the *Urim* was with *Saul* after that *Abia-r* fled to *David* on the Death of *Abimelech* s Father; that's true, if by the Ephod hich *Abiathar* carried from *Nob*, that *Ephod* meant which was made by *Moſes*, and hich was put on *Aaron*. But then he muſt told, that *Saul* having taken away the gh Prieſt's Life, and ſubſtituted another in s place another Ephod was alſo made, by hich *Saul* might conſult God? Does not e-ry body know, that none but the High ieſt might enter into the Holy Place on the ay of Atonement; and yet that Right was nſferred to another, if the High Prieſt hap-

pen'd to be unclean on the Eve of the Da
of Expiation, as the Jews observe in th
Treaty of the *Mishna* which is called *Jom*
or *The Day of Expiations.* I know very wel
that Mr. *Whiston* says, that the Ephod
which we read in 1 *Sam.* xxiii. 9, 10. and xx
7, 8. was only a sacred Garment, which D
vid put on in order to consult God himsel
and not by the Ministry of *Abiathar*, becau
it was different from that to which the Uri
was fasten'd. But unhappily for Mr. *Whis*
Josephus, did not understand the Distinc
Mr. *Whiston* has found out contrary to th
Style of the Scriptures. Nor did he, nor
Masters know, or so much as suspect, wh
Mr. *Whiston* tells us is said of *Abimelech*. Th
he had the Care of the holy things, at N
which did rather describe him as the Chi
of a *Brigade* of Priests who kept the Gu
in the Tabernacle, than as an High Priest.
it possible Mr. *Whiston* should have thoug
this to be agreeable to the Jews Opinio
when they suppose the direct contrary? Do
he not conclude this very reasonably fro
the Succession of the Priests of the Race
Eli, according as he has now first found o
and settled it? He wonders indeed that Co
mentators had never taken notice of the G
nealogy which he thinks is so plainly l
down 1 *Sam.* xiv. 3. and from whence he
so thinks it appears clearly, that *Abiathar*
was the High Priest towards the End of Sa

Reig

reign, when *David* eat the Shew-bread; and
of *Abimelech*, the Son of *Ahitub*, who was
only the Uncle of *Abiathar*. But he will not
give us leave to wonder, that in so learn-
ed an Age as this, he should dare to publish
such grounds less Imaginations: And I think it is
very unreasonable to charge Saul with pun-
ishing the High Priests to Death: But in that he
judges differently from all the ancient Jews,
he makes no Difficulty of believing it upon
the Authority of the Book of *Samuel*. He
supposes that the High Priest was with Saul
the day before he consulted the Witch at *Endor*,
that is to say, two Days before his Death:
So he thinks plain from 1 *Sam.* xxviii. 6.
and that it would be contrary to the Pro-
phecy against the Family of *Eli*, 1 *Sam.* ii.
31, 32. to suppose that *Abiathar* who
followed *David* was High Priest, because he
must have been 80 Years old in the nine-
teenth, when he deposed him. But he fights
an Objection from 2 *Kings* ii. 26. where
Abiathar is said to be the High Priest, having
before affirmed, that the *Abiathar* there men-
tioned was another *Abiathar* or another of
the same Name who had been afflicted with
Leprosy. He pretends that the List be-
made of the High Priests of the House
Eli, shews the Accomplishment of the Pro-
phecy against the House of *Eli* by the quick
turns in the Succession of the Descendants
of the others, and that it answers all the
Objections that can be raised.

I

I should very willingly leave Mr. *Whiston* to enjoy the satisfaction of these notable Discoveries without Molestation, if the Truth of the Scripture were not concerned in the Matter. I take no notice of the Ignorance with which he charges all the Commentators, whether Jews or Christians, Antients or Moderns. If we may believe him, he is the only Person by whom the Truth could be drawn out of the Well where she had lain so long. Happy Man, who could discover those things which no body could ever find out before him! But setting Raillery apart, I affirm, that Mr. *Whiston* has advanced nothing but Falsities, and such as must appear evidently so too, if it be true that *Abimelech*, of whom mention is made in the History of *Nob*, was the High Priest who was killed by *Saul*'s Command; and that *Abiathar*, who fled from *Nob* to *David*, was High Priest till the Beginning of *Solomon*'s Reign, who deposed him. I assert that there were not two Priests named *Abimelech*, one of whom was the Son of *Abijah*, who gave *David* the *Shewbread*, and the other the Son of *Abiathar* who was deposed by *Solomon*. I affirm That the List of the Priests of the Race of *Eli* which Mr. *Whiston* has given us, is a pure Invention of his own, without any Foundation. For all the Paradoxes, which he has so boldly advanced, are owing to his Ignorance of the Holy Scripture, and of the Jewish

I Custom

uſtoms, and of Sacred Chronology, which e has miſerably confounded.

I muſt not omit that which is of the greateſt conſequence in this Matter; I mean, how the rophecy in 1 *Sam.* ii. 31, 32, 33. was fulfil-d unto the time of *Solomon* who depoſed *bhiathar* the laſt Succeſſor of *Eli*, and put *adoc* in his place, who was of the Race of *leazar*. Mr. *Whiſton* imagines that the Pro-hecy muſt prove falſe if it be apply'd to *bhiathar*, who fled to *David* after the Death f his Father *Abimelech*, becauſe *Abiathar* uſt have been then above 80 Years old hen he was depoſed by *Solomon*. *Samuel's* ords are, that none of *Eli's* Race ſhould ver be *Zaken*, that is, according to the Style f the Scripture, ſhould never paſs the Age of o Years. The Jews have a Rule in their *iſna* concerning that Word *Zaken*, the haldee *Sio* anſwers to it, and ſignifies *an ld-man*. I ſuppoſe, after what I have al-eady made out on that Head, that *Abiathar* as the laſt High Prieſt of the Race of *Eli*; e was depoſed in the firſt Year of *Solomon*, . c. 477 Years after the Peoples going out of *gypt*. If he was then 80 Years old, as Mr. *hiſton* ſuppoſes, the Prophecy of *Samuel* was alſe; for he allows 40 Years for the Reign of *aul*, in the firſt of which *Abiathar* fled, af-er the Death of his Father: and 40 Years to hat of *David*, which make 80 Years, and e muſt ſuppoſe that he was 15 or 16 Years old

old when he fled, and so the Absurdity
Mr. *Whiston's* Account is easily discover
But if, on the contrary, *Saul* did not reig
40, but 2 Years only, all things are safe,
it will be easy to prove the Accomplishm
of the Prophecy, for then *Abiathar* m
not have lived above 55 or 57 Years at th
Mr. *Whiston* knows very well, that
thar carry away the *Ephod* with him,
we read, *Saul* with Mr. Abarbanel Commen
tors understood by the *Ephod* not a
Garment, which a Priest as *Samuel*, might
have worn, but the holy *Ephod* to which
Breast-plate was join'd which contain'd the
and *Thummim*, which Josephus Greek Interpr
translate, the gift *Hosai* [illegible]
the *Ephod*. It is plain that when *Da*
commands him to take the *Ephod*, 1 *Sa*
xxiii. 6. he commands him to put on
Robes of the High Priest, to consult God
him. But Mr. *Whiston* tells us, on the co
trary, that *David* and not *Abiathar*, pu
the Garment called the Ephod, to enquire
the Lord. I know that Dr. *Spencer* thoug
that *Saul* consulted God himself, without
Ministry of the High Priest, according
1 *Sam.* xxviii. 6. But that Notion, in
he followed *Samuel*, is contrary to th
Scripture. After Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion,
a groundless Imagination, for *David*, th
he was a Prophet, had no Right to enqu
of God, with a linen Ephod, and that
ble should

ould consider him as already consecrated
ing by *Samuel*, yet that would give him no
ight to break the express Law of God, by
uting on an Ephod, and enquiring of him;
nother that *Ephod* were a common one, or
e *Ephod* of the High Priest. If Mr. *Whiston*
ould ask, Whether we pretend that *Abia-*
r was of Age to exercise the Priest's Office,
for instance, to put on the *Ephod*? We
ay answer with the Jews, that the Presence
the High Priest, tho' under Age, authoris-
d any Priest to perform any part of the
riestly Office in his Name; and so, any o-
er Priest among those who were with *Da-*
d, might put on the *Ephod*, and enquire of
od for *David*. As for that Place where we
ad that God did not answer *Saul*, neither
Dreams, nor by the *Urim*, I own it does
t suppose that *Saul* sent to *Abiathar* to en-
ire of God for him, as *R. David Kimchi*
ought: But I affirm, That as there is men-
on made of the three ordinary ways of gi-
ng Answers to such Questions, 1. By those
o had Dreams; 2. By the Voice of the
gh Priest, whose Absence in such a Case
ng construed a Rebellion, we cannot doubt
t that *Saul* substituted another High Priest
his place out of those who remain'd with
m, because no other but the High Priest
ght put on the Sacerdotal Ephod; 3. By
Voice of the Prophets; for it's a palpable
surdity to suppose that after the Flight of

Abiathar,

Abiather, who had carry'd away the Ephod which belonged to him as High Priest after the Death of his Father, *Saul* did not cause another to be made according to the Description which God gave of it in his Law, Exod. xxviii. And so it will be true, nevertheless, that the High Priest whom *Saul* substituted would have had no Answer by wearing the Ephod when he consulted God for *Saul*. Don't we find that *Jeroboam*, after his Separation from the two Tribes, made another new Ephod, to which *Hosea* without doubt alludes, Chap. iii. 4. For he speaks only of the Kingdom of the ten Tribes. Besides, don't we also know that *Saul* was a wicked Man, who thought he might do whatever he pleased, and that therefore he was a likely Man enough to set up a new Priest, and make use of a new Ephod, in a case of such Consequence as when he was in the utmost Danger?

From the things I have been representing it appears plainly, that *Abimelech* was the High Priest who gave *David* the Shewbread, and that it's very probable, as *R. S. Jarchi* observes, that he enquired of God for *David*, for *David* had told him, that he was going about an important Affair for the King's Service. 2. It is plain that *Abiather*, *Abimelech*'s Son, who fled to *David*, and carry'd with him the Ephod to which the *Urim* was fasten'd, was High Priest after the Death of his Father

ther. From whence it follows, that Jesus
hrist spoke of *Abiathar* as the High Priest
ho gave *David* the Shewbread; and that
e mention'd his Name because it was more
nous than that of his Father *Abimelech*,
hom *Saul* slew with the rest of the Priests at
b the first Year of his Reign. And 3. That
hen Mr. *Whiston* denies that Jesus Christ
eaks of *Abiathar* who followed *David*, he
ews plainly, how little he is acquainted with
e Jewish Customs, and how careless he has
en of examining their Commentators. These
tle Criticisms concerning the Differences
tween the *Ephod* and the *Urim*, are so weak
d empty, that any Man who understood
e Jewish Customs would be asham'd of them.
That by a Chronology, contrary to that
the Scriptures, he has made a shift to con-
und himself, and give the Christians a great
al of Trouble, about a Point which the
ry Jews have settled much better than he
s been able to do with all his Study.

FINIS.

FINIS.